

ATTACHMENT A Remarks

Before considering the rejection on prior art, it is noted that claim 1 has been amended again to correct a grammatical error therein and, for consistency, to provide antecedent basis for one recitation ("primary display" has been changed to -- primary display device --). These changes do not impact on the patentability of claim 1 and clearly do not raise a new issue requiring further consideration and/or search.

Claims 1,2,6,11,23,24,27, and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fowler et al (Fowler) in view of Gouko. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

First, it is respectfully submitted that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been made here. As pointed out in the last response, the assertion that "Fowler and Gouko are applicable to each others invention" is not enough to provide a motivation for combining the two references.

More importantly, it is respectfully submitted that no fair combination of the references would result in the present invention as claimed. A core issue here concerns serious disagreement here as to the meanings of the recitations "a primary set of information" and a "secondary set of information." The use of "primary" and "secondary" mirrors the language used in the specification at, e.g., page 1 wherein it is stated that "in a word processing application such as Microsoft® Word, the goal would be to reduce the Toolbar and button areas (i.e., the secondary area) and increase the window in which the document is being edited (i.e., the primary area)." In essence, the "secondary sets of information" are interactive areas of an application that take up space that is desired for the display of other information, i.e., a document, or other objects that the application is working on, referred to as the "primary set of information." Because there is no common definition in the art for these types of information, the terms "primary set of information" and "secondary set of information" should take the meaning that applicant has given them for. This is an instance where the applicant is her own lexicographer, and it is respectfully submitted that the meanings that applicant assigned to the terms in question cannot be properly ignored.

Considering the latter point in more detail, in the Response to Arguments, reference is made throughout to “first information” and “second information” and it contended that “both Gouko and Fowler teaches of a first and second display, and therefore inherently also teach of a first and second display information.” It is respectfully submitted that this contention is not well taken. The Examiner appears to rely heavily on column 5, lines 30-60 of Gouko in the Response to Arguments and in the basic rejection (which refers to Gouko column 5, lines 54-55 and Gouko, column 5, lines 40-50). It is respectfully submitted that nothing taught in these lines corresponds to the primary and secondary sets of information being claimed. In particular, Gouko describes, in these passages, sub-panels for showing “... left and right areas or upper and lower areas...” of an overall scene and, with respect to a car chase game states that “a scene around the car can be displayed in a real manner by being divided into the sub-panels, respectively” (see col. 5, lines 51-61). It is respectfully submitted that Gouko is merely using the secondary displays to show more of the overall scene and, in any event, there is no teaching in Gouko of using a secondary display for “a secondary set of information” as claimed in each of the independent claims. The Examiners appears to be taking the position that because the plurality of display panels can be used to display an image which is larger in size or which covers more area than that displayed by a single panel, the portion of the image displayed by the further display panels is necessarily “secondary information.” It is respectfully submitted that this interpretation of the claim language is inconsistent with the meaning assigned in the claims to the terms “a primary set of information” and “ a secondary set of information.”

Further, regarding the same issue, the Examiner also contends that the Rebeske patent teaches this aspect of the invention and, in this regard, the Examiner states that “Rebeske alternately reads on applicants invention such that a first screen 64 shows a first and second information, said primary information being the tool menu selection data, and when the second display extended the second display information is shown on the second display 70 and the first display is shown in figure. 4, the total viewing area being generally enlarged by having an extended display, and in line with usual desktop functions capable of enlargement.” It is respectfully submitted that the Rebeske patent only provides for displaying what should be regarded as a subset of the

information from the first display and does not disclose the display of a "set of secondary information" on the second display screen. Rather, the Rebeske device permits "the operator to exclude certain non-essential display matters on the second display screen while leaving those display matters on the first display screen." Moreover, the patent provides that the "second display screen 70 may then be pivoted away from the axis as shown in FIG. 5 wherein the second display screen faces away from the operator of the computer." This is actually a teaching away from displaying further information, because such further information is not even visible by the operator of the computer in such a position. In any event, it is not seen that the Rebeske patent is any more relevant than the Gouko patent with respect to this key feature of the present invention.

Claim 1 also recites that "wherein upon extension of the secondary display device, the primary set of information is displayed in a larger viewing area of the primary display device." It is respectfully submitted that the references do not reach or suggest, and the Office Action does not point out any passage in Fowler or Gouko that teaches or suggests, the "upon extension" limitation cited above. Fowler and Gouko are silent on when or how their primary set of information is displayed in a larger viewing area of their primary display device. Because neither Fowler or Gouko describe reconfiguring their display devices upon extension, presumably their devices must be rebooted after extending the panels in order to achieve the benefits of panel extension. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Fowler and Gouko, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of amended independent claim 1.

Independent claims 23 and 33 include limitations similar to those of claim 1. For the reasons given above, it is respectfully submitted that Fowler and Gouko, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of independent claims 23 and 33.

Dependent claims 2, 6, 11, 24, 27, and 29 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 or 23, and include all the limitations of the claims 1 or 23. For the reasons given above, Fowler and Gouko, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 2, 6, 11, 24, 27, and 29.

Claims 13, 16, 17, 21, 34, 39, and 40 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fowler in view of Gouko, Rebeske et al (Rebeske), and Haneda et al. (Haneda). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted above, it is respectfully submitted that there is no valid teaching or suggestion in the references that would lead to combining the Fowler and Gouko. The Office Action asserts that "given the purpose of Fowler and Gouko is to extend the primary display area by extending a secondary display, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to accomplish this objective by known electro-mechanical control and software reconfiguration methods as taught by Rebeske and Haneda." However, it is respectfully submitted that the Office Action has mischaracterized the "purpose" of Fowler and Gouko. Fowler and Gouko describe a display device with extendible sub panels. The references do not describe extending the sub panels during operation, and without this description, it cannot be assumed that the display provided is modified during operation in response to extending of the sub-panels. Therefore, Office Action does not provide a teaching or suggestion to combine Fowler, Gouko, Rebeske, and Haneda, and it is respectfully submitted that this rejection is necessarily based on an improper hindsight analysis of the rejected claims.

Additionally, the cited combination does not teach or suggest each and every element of the rejected claims. Independent claim 13 teaches a displaying " a secondary set of information for the computer automatically upon extension of the secondary display device." As noted above, Fowler and Gouko do not teach a secondary set of information, nor do they teach displaying the secondary set of information upon extension of the secondary display device. The Office Action does not point to any passages in Haneda or Rebeske that teach or suggest displaying a secondary set of information on a secondary display device. Instead, both Haneda and Rebeske teach displaying the same information on two different displays. Independent claims 34 and 41 include similar limitations. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the cited combination does not teach or suggest each and every element of independent claims 13, 34 and 41.

Dependent claims 16, 21, 17, 39, and 40 depend directly or indirectly from claims 13 and 34. All of these claims include limitations discussed above. As noted above,

Fowler, Gouko, Rebeske and Haneda, in combination do not, teach or suggest the claim limitations. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the cited combination does not teach or suggest each and every element of dependent claims 16, 17, 21, 39, and 40.

Claims 22, 25, 26, 30, 31, 32, and 35 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fowler in view of Gouko, Rebeske, Haneda and Hendry et al. (Hendry). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted above, it is respectfully submitted that the Office Action does not point out a valid teaching or suggestion in the references to combine Fowler, Gouko, Rebeske and Haneda. It is asserted that it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention to modify the computer display device as taught by Rebeske by including software as suggested by Hendry and Haneda to reconfigure the display systems. However, since the Office Action does not point to any passage that provides teaching or suggestion to combine the references and thus it is respectfully submitted that the rejection here is based on an improper hindsight analysis of the rejected claims.

Additionally, the cited combination does not teach or suggest each and every element of the rejected claims. Independent claim 22 teaches "when the at least one secondary display device can be extended from the housing and used to display primary and secondary information." As noted above, Fowler and Gouko do not teach the limitation of a secondary display device that is used to display the secondary set of information. In order for Fowler, Gouko, Rebeske, Haneda, and Hendry to teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations of independent claim 22, Rebeske, Haneda or Hendry must disclose what Fowler and Gouko are lacking. However, the Office Action has not pointed to any passage in Rebeske, Haneda, or Hendry that teaches that "the at least one secondary display device can be extended from the housing and used to display primary and secondary information." Independent claims 30 and 32 include similar limitations.

Independent claim 22 also teaches "displaying a reconfiguration screen on the primary display device." The Office Action asserts that Figure 3 of Hendry is an example of a structure for a display notification is illustrated. However, it is respectfully submitted

that the Office Action has mischaracterized Figure 3 of Hendry. The Hendry structure is a data structure containing information for the operating system and other software programs, not for user input. "The information that is provided to the operating system and other software programs by the display manager, in response to a change in configuration, comprises a list of pairs of display state descriptors. An example of a structure for a display notification is illustrated in FIG. 3" (Hendry column 5, lines 55-60). Therefore, the structure would not be shown, as the Office Action asserts "to the user for input and notice of said configuration." Additionally, the Office Action does not point to any passage in Hendy that discloses or suggests the provision of a reconfiguration screen.

Independent claim 30 teaches "transmitting a reconfiguration signal to a computer" and "reconfiguring the computer such that the computer displays primary application information in the primary display device to increase a viewing area in the primary display device for the primary application information." The Office Action does not point to any passages in the cited combination that teach or suggest these limitations. For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Fowler, Gouko, Rebeske, Haneda, and Hendry does not teach or suggest each and every element of independent claims 22, 30 and 32.

Dependent claims 25, 26, 31, 35, and 38 depend directly or indirectly from claims 22, 30, and 32 and are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above in support of the parent claims.

Claims 3-5, 7-10, 14, 15, 18-20, 28, 36, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fowler, Gouko, Rebeske, Haneda, Hendry and Failla (Failla.) This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted above, the Office Action has not provided a valid reason to combine Fowler, Gouko, Rebeske, Haneda, and Hendry. The Office Action also does not point out a suggestion in the references to combine the references with Failla.

Additionally, regarding claims 8, 9, 10, 19, 20, and 28, the Office Action asserts that Failla teaches an inverter board. Applicant has found no passage in Failla that teaches an inverter board. The Office Action also asserts that "said conductive path and reconfiguration are inherent the device of Fowler and Gouko." As noted before, Fowler

and Gouko do not teach reconfiguration. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the cited combination does not and cannot teach or suggest each and every element of the rejected claims.

End Remarks